

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| WILLIAM H. STEINBRINK, M.D., |) | |
| et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiffs, |) | |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | Civil Action No. 01-382-E |
| |) | |
| ROTHSTEIN, KASS & COMPANY, |) | |
| P.C., et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

O R D E R

AND NOW, this 12th day of October, 2006, after a review of the Amended Complaint, the Court finds that Plaintiffs have failed to comply with Local Rule of Court 8.1 which provides that:

Except in diversity cases in which a party must plead that the matter in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000, any pleading demanding general damages unliquidated in amount shall, **without claiming any specific sum**, set forth only that money damages are claimed. The categories of damages so claimed may be specified and the claiming party is not precluded from seeking additional damages at a later date.

LR 8.1 (emphasis added).

Therefore, Plaintiffs shall file a Second Amended Complaint no later than October 23, 2006, which complies with Local Rule of Court 8.1.

The Amended Complaint (document No. 40) violating said
Local Rule of Court 8.1 shall be placed under seal.

s/Maurice B. Cohill, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

ecf: Counsel of record